



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/606,252	06/25/2003	Stuart Gerson	MISS-103.2(C)	4494

909 7590 02/10/2004

PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

CHAN, KO HUNG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3632

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/606,252

Applicant(s)

GERSON, STUART

Examiner

Korie H. Chan

Art Unit

3632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The preliminary amendment filed 6/25/2003 has been entered. The status of the claims are as follows. Claims 1-18 have been cancelled. Currently, claims 19-30 are pending.

Claim Objections

Claims 20-30 are objected to because of the following informalities: claims 20-25 depend from cancelled claim 1 and claims 27-30 depend from cancelled claim 11. Regarding claim 26, line 1, "rug and clip assembly f, the" should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required.

For the sake of expediting prosecution, claims 20-25 are treated as if each is dependent from claim 19, while claims 27-30 are treated as if each is dependent from claim 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 19, 20, and 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zoroufy (US patent no. 5,318,174) in view of Salrin et al (US patent no. 5,152,404) and Holt (US patent no. 2,483,051). Zoroufy'174 discloses a rug clip for suspending a rug (Col. 2, line 65) having a channel-shaped bracket (114) with top portion and front leg and rear leg extending perpendicularly therefrom and a clip

Art Unit: 3632

mechanism of the cam action type having an inner jaw (92, figure 6) extending from the front leg and outer jaw (80) pivotally attached to the front leg and a cam arm (106) pivotally attached to the front leg to bias the inner and outer jaws into engagement with one another. Furthermore, Zoroufy disclose that the rod 22 to which the channel-shaped bracket is mounted on can be rectangular bar (col. 3, lines 28-30). However, Zoroufy does not show a non-slip material on the undersurface of the channel bracket. Salrin teaches mounting rug display brackets (28) having top portion (13) and perpendicularly legs (22 and 24) to compliment the rectangular bar to which the bracket is mounted on. Salrin also provides protective cap on a leg (45) attached to the channel bracket which engages the bar to "prevent scuffing or scratching of interacting surfaces" (Col, 5, lines 50-55).

Holt'051 teaches mounting articles upon a door wherein the mounting bracket comprises a channel-shaped bracket (16, figure 3) with a top portion, front and rear legs extending generally perpendicularly there from of providing non-slip material on the bottom surface of the top portion as well as the front and rear legs to prevent marring. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the channel-shaped bracket of Zoroufy such that it is adapted for mounting onto a rectangular cross-sectioned member as demonstrated by Salrin for stable mounting onto a rectangular member and to provide non-slip material on the bottom surface of the channel bracket to preventing marring or scuffing or scratching of the interacting surfaces as taught to be desirable by Holt and also preferred by Salrin.

Further, it would have been an obvious matter of mechanical expedient to mount the non-slip material via the convention means of adhesive as such is old and well-known. Further, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to have the non-slip material to be of natural rubber, butyl, EPDM, hypalon, neoprene, and nitrile and to provide a clip of stainless steel or galvanized plain steel as such materials for non-slip material and clips are notoriously old and well-known in the art.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zoroufy (US patent no. 5,318,174) in view of Salrin et al (US patent no. 5,152,404) and Holt (US patent no. 2,483,051) as applied to claim 19 aboved and further in view of either Cloughton (US patent no. 6,481,585) or Peacock (US patent no. 2,626,713). Zoroufy'174, Salrin, and Holt combined demonstrated all the structural features of applicant's invention except for the spring type clip. Such spring clip is old and well-known. Peacock'713 teaches a metal clip comprising a channel-shaped bracket (2, figure 2) with a top portion, front and rear legs extending generally perpendicularly there from (fig. 5) and a clip mechanism including two opposing jaws (8 and 10) pivotally secured to each other and biased by a coil spring (12). Cloughton also teaches a spring type of clip (11 and 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute the clip of Zoroufy, Salrin, and holt combined such it is of a spring type clip as taught by either Peacock or Cloughton. Such modification would have involved substituting one well-known type of clip for another.

Response to Arguments


Applicant's arguments filed 6/25/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's argument basically is that the non-slip material of Holt cannot be place onto a slidably suspendable hook of Zoroufy. Examiner now has provided the reference of Salrin which teaches displaying a rug by a channel-shaped bracket onto a rectangular rod where sliding on rod is not a necessary part of the invention. Indeed, Salrin teaches the need for non-slip material even though it is disposed on other parts of the mounting bracket than what is claimed by applicant and that teaching is provided by Holt. Salrin, nevertheless, provides the teaching that having non-slip material prevents scuffing and scratching of the interacting surfaces. The application of various well-known mounting hardware mounted onto various well-known display fixture is old and well-known. It is well-known that hooks can be mounted onto bars, panels, doors, windows, etc... as demonstrated by the art of record. Such application is a mere function of the existence of the type of display fixture available at the time of use. To place Zoroufy's old and well-known rug clip bracket onto the panel display fixtures of Salrin would have been obvious. And to further provide a non-slip material to the mounting bracket where marring and scratching of the interacting surfaces are of concern would have been obvious as taught by both Salrin and Holt. Such provision of non-slip material does not provide unexpected results.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Korie H. Chan whose telephone number is 703-305-8079. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leslie Braun can be reached on 703-308-2156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Korie H. Chan
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3632

Khc
February 5, 2004